

The Republican.

No. 27. Vol. 6.] LONDON, Friday, Nov. 29, 1822. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE WOMEN OF THE ISLAND OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Dorchester Gaol, Nov. 25, Year 1822,
of the *Virgin Mother's Son*.

As many of you as have thought proper have had, or will have, an opportunity to read the speech prepared by Mrs. Wright to address the Court of King's Bench. Barring a few trivial printer's errors, that speech is now in print, in spite of the forbidding of the Judges of that Court.

I have not yet laid before you a report of what passed in the Court of King's Bench, in the case of Mrs. Wright on the 14th instant, as I wait an opportunity to possess the most correct account possible. Pay no attention to what you read of the matter in the newspapers or other prints, you shall by and by have every particular as it occurred. The greatest abuse connected with the press of this country is a false and mangled report of public proceedings, where occurrences are falsified and coloured to suit the party passions that adhere to different newspapers. To be candid, I confess that there is more honour on this point attaching to what are called ministerial than to those called opposition papers. The Newspaper Press of this country does not yet, as a whole, deserve any higher character than that of being a prostituted vehicle for lies, deceptions, and delusions. I know but one London paper that merits the epithet of being impartial, or of studying impartiality, and the best means of propagating intelligence, and that is "THE EXAMINER." "The British Luminary" regularly contains an admirable leading article, but the making up of the other part of the paper disgraces it, and by no means lightens our darkness on any subject. "The Stamford News" is now making its way as the best and boldest country paper, and evidently endeavours to report public occurrences with as much impartiality as its local situation will admit of.— Essays, and comments on different subjects in newspapers,

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street.

are not of half so much value as a correct report of what passes to the interest or prejudice of the community. Comment more becomes the pamphlet press, and essays require more deliberation and comparison than any weekly publication can afford. This alludes to an editorial view of the matter; the essays and favours of correspondents form an exception to the general rule.

I thought it best to print Mrs. Wright's speech as a whole, without alluding to any interruptions, or to the part where she was finally stopped, as, in a complete state, you can form a better idea of it, and whether it contained any thing that was really objectionable to an honest Judge. I allow that the whole matter is objectionable to come before a Court of Law, but then, the fault rests with those who prosecute, who get up an indictment upon such frivolous and fallacious matters. The whole subject of religion is totally unfit for discussion under legal forms, as it can never be brought under any just legal decisions. It is a matter of opinion which every man is bound to defend or reject as he may think proper, and he ought not to be held accountable for any thing of the kind.

On you, the female part of the community, I wish most anxiously, and most particularly, to impress, that religion has nothing to do with morality, and that to your children the former is as pernicious as the latter is wholesome. The Priests tell you that it is your duty to impress the minds of your children at the earliest moment with what they call religious principles, but be you assured, that such principles are as so much poison to the infant mind, and checks its expansion. In teaching the nonsense called religion to your children, you corrupt the very bud of their minds, and it becomes a mere matter of accident, if ever that bud unfolds a blossom: whereas, if you impress no other language upon it than the language of morality and science, you would, like a skilful botanist, nourish the bud, and assist its expansion, until it blossoms and brings forth a delightful fruit.

The distinctions drawn between morality and religion in Mrs. Wright's speech are unanswerable, and prove that they have no mark of relation, and that neither depends upon the other, but are best seen when separated and alone. But her Judges would not wait for that part of her argument, though they may rely on it they shall hear it before they give her a final sentence, and a much larger quantity of argument than she was prepared with before, if they keep her in Newgate until January.

The part of her speech at which she was finally stopped was at the epitome of the Thirty-nine Articles, but if you will refer to a copy of those Articles, you will find it an exact representation of them. There is not the least colouring in the matter. The case is, the Christian religion is founded upon the most monstrous absurdities that were ever promulgated among mankind. There is not a Priest or a Christian living that could defend his religion by sober discussion with me for one hour, and, knowing this, I have made up my mind to do my utmost in putting it down. Since writing the foregoing I have received a letter from Mrs. Wright, in which she informs me, that on arriving at Newgate, she was put into a cell with five female convicts, two of which were under sentence of death; but after some time she was removed to the Infirmary. She is dauntless, and will not shrink from doing her duty; and by every thing that is virtuous and good, I call upon you to encourage and support her.

You will see that her speech throughout did not contain one offensive expression to any mind but that of a rank hypocrite. It is studied moral and legal argument why no punishment should have been inflicted upon her, and relevant to her case in almost every sentence. The Judges of the Court of King's Bench who committed her for contempt of themselves, have committed themselves likewise. We may not find any member of the present Parliament to take up the subject, notwithstanding all the big, frog-like promises of Mr. Hobhouse to make a substantial motion in such cases, but be you assured, that so long as any one of those four corrupt fellows who fill the bench in that Court shall be living, impeachment shall never be lost sight of.

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

THE advocates of religion continually trumpet forth their boastful pretences of the irresistible evidence by which it is supported, and they affect to challenge the most daring and inquisitive search into its truth, yet in spite of all this parade so fearfully sensitive are they to the gentlest disturbance of their celestial plant, that they deem it necessary to intimidate and chain up all its enemies, partly by private obloquy and ruin, partly by the more undisguised tyranny of the law. So tremendous is the gag by which they have muzzled up all dissentients, that it requires a degree of resolution possessed by none but yourself, to erect the standard of resistance and to sub-

scribe your name to propositions as rational as they are beneficial. The suffering which you are enduring in this most glorious of contests, are such as we should naturally expect to see inflicted while the sword yet remains with those who now hold it. The inflexible courage, and the calm force of reason and principle with which you have met these cruelties, are qualities which I could not have expected *from any man* in the present temper of society; and the day will come when they will be appreciated as they so richly merit.

Perceiving that your excellent journal is the single publication extant, where superstition is fully unmasked and its inmost roofs exposed to view. I feel beyond measure anxious that you should prosecute this aim by the shortest as well as the surest means, that you should direct your efforts at once and exclusively, to lay bare the depraved and contradictory stuff which religious systems have so deeply fastened in the human associations. This and this only should be your end, an end as difficult as it is admirable; and the extreme difficulty of accomplishing it under any circumstances should make you very careful not to mix up with it any ulterior corollaries of your own, nor to substitute any new doctrine in place of the phantoms which you are seeking to dissipate.

I think I have remarked in those writings of yours where you refute the evidence for the being of a God, a disposition to propose some other mode of accounting for the phenomena of nature, you appear to think (if I do not mistake) that he who rejects the dogmas of the Theist is bound to suggest some other theory to explain the original commencement and subsequent changes of the material universe; perhaps I have misinterpreted your sentiments, but even if I have the above is an error too common among Atheists, and a few remarks upon it will not be superfluous.

So long as an Atheist maintains his negative ground and confines himself to the attack of his antagonists, so long are his arguments quite unexceptionable and victorious. When he attempts to substitute any theory of his own in lieu of that which he is assailing, he becomes as vulnerable and defenceless as his adversary. Indeed he becomes in appearance far more vulnerable than the latter; for Theism has from incessant habit so engrained itself, and its inconsistencies have been so smartly plastered over, that demonstration itself can scarcely make its grossest absurdities perceptible; whereas when you attempt to father the universe upon any new fiction not thus consecrated by habit, the absurdity of the doctrine instantly presents itself in the most pointed manner to a man prepossessed, as all men now are, in favour of Theism. When Epicurus desired the divine origin of the world and attempted to account for its formation by means of atoms, his enemies passed over his negative arguments, to which they could not have replied, and fastened upon his proposed explanatory system which it was easy for them to shiver in pieces.

I think an Atheist should avow in the very outset his entire ignorance of the question which the Theist professes to determine, he must not scruple to concede that it is a point utterly insoluble by the human faculties.

This will appear from a very few words:—

What the Theist pretends, is to trace out the original commencing phenomena, of that series of events which we now witness, and which our fellow creatures have witnessed for many thousand years; now at this primary link it is impossible for the human understanding to arrive. For what is the reason from which we infer that any phenomena (call it M.) has preceded any other phenomena N. at any preceding epoch of which we have had no experience, say 5000 years ago? It is because we observe that M does now precede N, and that it has done so in nearer periods of which we had no experience; but the same experience which informs us that M thus precedes N, also informs us that some other phenomena L or I or H precedes M. By the same evidence therefore in virtue of which we believe that M. has occurred prior to N, by the very same do we know that some other phenomenon has occurred prior to M; you cannot reject the latter proposition without also rejecting the former. Hence it appears in the clearest manner that any attempt to discover what is the first in order of the series of phenomenon, in other words, *that before which nothing has occurred*, must be altogether ineffectual and nugatory. You cannot pretend to affirm any thing at all about the past, without calling in the testimony of experience and therefore you are bound to abide by what experience determines, but every phenomenon of which you have had experience, has been preceded by some other. It is in vain therefore that you search for any phenomenon such as to have had no antecedent; and to be itself the initiator of the series.

When therefore the Theist inquires how I account for the original of things: I reply that I do not know and that I have no means of finding out, concede to him his omnipotent father of the world, and he is still as far as ever from the starting post, of the series of phenomena; if he pretends to trace up the pedigree of the universe, let him be prepared to go up a little higher, and to explain the parentage of its divine manufacturer, if the step from universe to universe makers, be authorised by experience, then does the very same experience call upon us to take another step from universe maker to universe maker's maker, and so on into an endless *et cætera*. By the supposition of Deity, therefore, even should we grant it, the Theist approaches not the least nearer to the original of things, he merely shifts the scene and conducts us many ages back to a date prior as he supposes to the commencement of matter, when nothing was to be found except what he calls an ante-material entity, whose original he is quite unable to explain.

But what evidence is there which authorizes the supposition of such an ante-material person? There is not one tittle of evidence, and all the pretended proofs which have been so presumptuously dressed out to veil the weakness of the argument are merely a continuation of the dreams and deliria of childhood. A few remarks will lay open the real merits of the supposition.

1. The object of all explanation is to make the reader understand

and to shew him what at first surprises and puzzles him is analogous to something with which he is already acquainted and familiarized. *We explain the unknown by the known.* Now the design of the Theist is to explain the original start as well as the existing series of material phenomena. For this purpose he has recourse to an ante-material dynasty, out of which *ancien régime*, he informs us the present universe took its rise, by the fiat of the reigning autocrat. Is this I ask explaining the unknown by the known? Which do we know best, the material universe, or that state of things which preceded it? with the present laws of matter I am at least partially acquainted. Of the ante-material world I am utterly ignorant what were its laws or its phenomenon? I know not nor can I learn from any one. You tell me that God alone existed in it. But God himself is to me a perfect incognito. And when I humbly enquire what he is, Theists barbarously trifle with my anxiety by telling me what he is not: Is he a man? No. Is he an animal? No. Put the same question successively with regard to all known things and you will be told God is none of them. *In what respect then does he differ from nothing?*

I am surely warranted in asserting that we cannot pretend to explain a partially known universe, by an ante-material system and a God both altogether unknown. We cannot expect to better ourselves by passing from incomplete visions into the blackest and most irremediable darkness. But farther, there is no point upon which Theists so frequently and unanimously expatiate, as upon the utter incompetency and worthlessness of their own theory—surprising indeed is this fact but it is not the less real. How immense (they assert) are the wonders of Creation! How infinitely more wonderful, how far above human comprehension must the Creator be! Let us just examine these pious effusions, wherein the believer compliments God upon having made an unintelligible world, and upon being still more unintelligible himself? You have pourtrayed to me the wonders of the material world: I come to you to seek an explanation of them. But your explanation of them, according to your account, is still more wonderful than the thing to be explained. You explain the less wonder by the greater, you get rid of a smaller difficulty by introducing one still more embarrassing. Again you have shewn that the phenomena of the universe are incomprehensible. I ask you for some theory which may enable me to understand them. You produce to me your God, but unhappily he is more *incomprehensible still*; All that your explanation does, therefore, is to give me two incomprehensibles, instead of one incomprehensible. Instead of enlightening me, you render me more ignorant than I was before.

Such are the sentiments which Theists themselves avow as to the explanatory force of their theory. There cannot be a more distinct confession of its absurdity. All the labyrinth in which they have entangled themselves arises from their ignorance of the real nature, of the explanatory process attempted, and from their having in consequence to solve an insolvable question. Our faculties reach only as far as to explain one event by another, to demonstrate certain complicated and

perplexing transactions when accurately scrutinized as analogous to other more familiar facts and as referable to a common general principle. Here we have one portion of the material series *known*, another portion *unknown*, and the skill consists in approximating the two, and in employing the former to elucidate the latter. But when you attempt to explain the whole material series—when you place the whole of the series among the *unknown*, what known phenomena are there left behind, by the help of which you are to explain it? You have no experience or knowledge of any other series excepting the present material series; and therefore, although you may compare its parts one with another, there is nothing whatever with which you can compare it when considered as a whole.

Thus much for the competency of this theory to explain the difficulty which it professes to remove. I now proceed to the reasons offered in behalf of it. 2. The universe (we are told) bears about it the marks of design and contrivance like “the works of men. As we conclude that a watch or a ship is the production of human skill, there is the same reason to infer that the world is the construction of some intelligent artist.” All the ingenuity of religionists has been exerted to assimilate and confound these two cases of influence. Yet no two things can be more different, compare the two with any thing like precision, and you will be astonished that even superstition herself should have dared to build up so flimsy an argument. All that we know of design is from the works of designing beings, that is, of human beings. This is conceded by the religionist. All the marks of design therefore in a thing, consist in resemblance to that which human beings execute. Now, in what respect does a ship or a watch, the production of man, resemble a plant or an animal, alleged to be the production of God? Is it possible to find things more thoroughly heterogenous in every respect? The parts of any animal, you say, are exquisitely adapted to certain ends; so are those of a watch. I reply, that to talk of the ends for which an animal is intended, is begging the question. The very point in dispute is, whether it is the work of design at all; whether there were or were not any ends contemplated in the construction of it. I know by *independent evidence* that watches were designed to answer certain ends: I do not merely conjecture this from examining the parts of a watch, but I know the motives which induces myself, and other people, to go to the watchmakers and purchase them. Had I not known this intended end from independent sources, I could never have learnt it by merely inspecting the watch and its parts. Neither can I know by contemplating an animal or a plant, what design it was intended to answer, or whether it was intended to answer any design at all.

“But, the phenomena of plants and animals,” it is urged, “are regular and orderly: so are the products of design;” therefore, plants and animals are also products of design: in the first place, the productions of human design are *not* necessarily regular; the actions of a madman are just as much the productions of design as those of a philosopher. The universe might have been just as much

the legitimate child of an incomprehensible God, if it had been altogether irregular, as in the present case when it is partially regular. This exalted personage might have designed to produce phenomena each perfectly different from the other, as well as phenomena sometimes agreeing and sometimes disagreeing. Regularity, therefore, is no more a proof of design than irregularity. In the next place if design is seen to produce regular effects, other causes are seen to bring about results equally regular, and even more so; combustion, electricity, crystallization, all these produce effects just as regular as design. If, therefore, you call the universe a regular effect, and for that reason ascribe it to design. I desire to know why you have not just the same reason to ascribe it to combustion or crystallization?

But, in truth, nothing except the loosest habits of thought could prevent us from seeing that what is called the effect of design in God, is the most opposite thing imaginable to the effect of human design. Human design supposes the properties of natural substances to be already existing. It merely causes the manifestation of some properties instead of others. The design of the carpenter occasions that which was a tree, and endued with the properties of life and vegetation, to become a ship, and to manifest the properties of being impelled and manageable in the water. All that he does is to transform the tree into a ship by the application of certain other substances and properties of nature. Had there been no pre-existent tree the carpenter might have designed the ship for any length of time, but no ship would have been constructed. It is not therefore the carpenter's design alone which causes the production of the ship, but the carpenter's design concurring with the pre-existence of certain fit and attainable substances. In fact, as Lord Bacon has remarked, in the fourth aphorism of the *Novum Organum*, "Man does nothing more than move material substances from one place to another, every thing else is performed by the internal properties of nature." This definition of the agency of human design is strictly precise.

Now let us examine the analogy which religionists describe to be so close between this agency and what they call the works of the Divinity, so that from seeing the former they affect to have plainly detected the unseen inference of the latter, "The transformation of a tree into a ship is the effect of design: but the transformation of nothing into a tree is exactly similar to the transformation of a tree into a ship; therefore the transformation of nothing into a tree is also the effect of design." Is not this inference singularly cogent and logical? I shall beg leave to suggest another which appears to me nearly as good. "The transformation of water into steam is the effect of fire; but the transformation of nothing into water is exactly similar to that of water into steam, therefore the transformation of nothing into water must also be the effect of fire." Does not this "natural Theology" of the fire-worshippers appear to you rather difficult of refutation? Will the worshipper of design be good enough to furnish me with an answer to such impie-

ties? Perhaps it may be alleged, that the Deity did not create the world out of nothing, but that there was an elementary chaos which he reduced into order and method, but the supposition of the complete original privacy of God is incomparably the most pious and reverent, and is, I believe, asserted by the greater number of divines, and even were it otherwise, to substitute the words "unknown something," instead of the word "nothing," in the syllogisms just cited will leave the reasoning just as conclusive or inconclusive as it is at present.

I have often wondered that religionists do not employ an argument which appears to me even more irrefragable than the one above cited, for the purpose of demonstrating the divine origin of the world. In order to warrant the inference which they enforce, it was incumbent on them to have adduced examples of formations of nothing. Now numerous instances of this sort may be extracted from the interesting and well attested narratives of Mother Bouch. When we consider the examples which this respectable old Lady cites, of the producing of all manner of things out of nothing, may we not be warranted in conjecturing that a similar act of legerdemain may have given rise to the universe? I merely hint this as being an analogy apparently rather more precise than that upon which the worshippers of design at present rest their proof, and I shall leave it to their farther consideration. I am sometimes at a loss to account for the conduct of those subtle reasoners, and particularly for the constant pains which they take to provide the refutation of their own theory. Thus, in the former part of this letter, I remarked upon this distinct avowal, how insufficient their supposition was to explain the phenomena after they had trumpeted it forth as absolutely required on account of the incomprehensibility of the universe without it. Here again we may discern an example of their unwillingness to tempt human reason beyond what it can bear, and of their anxiety to provide a means of escape along with the temptation. Most unceasingly do they ejaculate, "How incomparably do the works of God overpass those of man! how far above all the productions of human design is this mighty universe! how little can the power of God be even conceived by the utmost reach of human imagination!" These are topics on which they never cease to expatiate when they wish to aggrandize the divinity in our eyes, and yet the only reason for supposing the existence of this divine workman is, the extreme resemblance which his alleged products bear to the works of human industry! When you are proving his existence you represent the universe as exactly like a ship or a watch, and himself as the prototype of a carpenter, or a watchmaker, when you have planted him pretty firmly in the imagination; you reverse the sentiment, and tell me that no two things can be more different, than the divine and the human artist! Again you admit distinctly that the universe is too great to have been produced by human design, but human design is the only design of which we have any experience. If then the universe is too great to have been produced by human design, it is too great to have been produced by design at all. If the design in heaven be different from the design upon

earth, the productions of the latter can form no ground for inferring the existence and agency of the former. To make use of this plea is, in fact, to avow that you abuse language to entrap the hearer into a conclusion—that you knowingly call two different things by the same name. Such is the manner in which religionists in these loyal addresses of praise which are esteemed so grateful to the divine ear, dexterously hurry and break the force of their own previous reasonings. I refrain from touching upon any of the more palpable difficulties which *unenlightened* reason discovers in the sublime hypothesis of design, I know that theological arguments have shewn that a slight infusion of poverty and famine into the lot of mankind—the distribution of stone, a gout and fever through a proper proportion of human bodies—all these and many more such are among the happiest and most indispensable manifestations of an all-powerful benevolence. It is gratifying to live under a dispensation so ingenious in devising new modes of inflicting kindnesses.

I shall conclude by again calling your attention to that subject which constitutes the primary aim of this letter. It appears to me most important in discussing and crumbling to pieces the miserable frame-work which superstition has built up, in order to explain the origin of the world that we should most frankly confess our entire ignorance of the subject, and that we should further assert to be a point beyond the reach of human conclusion; because the whole extent of human discovery can only enable us to apply one part of the material system to explain another part, and if this be true, the whole universe, as a whole, must still remain unexplained, since there remains nothing to explain it by; and because too the very same inference from the present to the past which alone authorises us to conclude that any phenomenon has occurred at some distant epoch, also inevitably pronounces, that that phenomenon itself must have had some other antecedent to usher it in. By thus confining your arguments to the negative side, and by disclaiming all aim at any rival solution of your own as even practicable, it appears to me that you will place the anti-superstitious creed on a basis altogether impregnable.

That this creed may through your most valuable and laborious exertions be shortly placed before men's minds in a different aspect from that in which they view it at present, is the sincerest wish of him who now addresses you.

I may perhaps again have occasion ere long, to touch a little more fully upon a few of the sublime doctrines of religion.

GALLUS.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

You may smile at my presumption in taking up my pen to write to a man like you, which I should have done long ago but the want

London, Nov. 16, 1822.

of education has kept me back, I should not have attempted it now, but being confident of your good sense that you would not ridicule me for my presumption, and having a wish to express to my fellow country women, how much I was once terrified at hearing my Husband read your "Republican" on religious principles, that I have shed many a tear, and left the house the moment he has took your book to read. The case is altered, for the moment your book comes into the house, I am anxious to read it, and I have looked carefully over it the last twelvemonth, expecting to see my fellow country women come forward and express themselves on the subject concerning the Bible. Had I never read your "Republican," I should always have been miserable and in fear of everlasting torment, for sins committed on this earth. I have often thought when reading the Bible, that the almighty never could punish us miserable creatures in the manner described in that book. Sir, I hope there is not a married man who takes your "Repnblican" but reads it to his wife. I fear they do not for if they did I think they would have come forward before this. I am confident there are thousands of females in this country would if they had heard your "Republican" read as I have done especially after perusing your No. 6, Vol. 5. where you give the "Character of Woman." Alas ! Sir, I fear this part has never been read to the wives of those men who take your "Republican." Now, Sir, you call upon every woman whether old or young to shake off those prejudices, those trammels in which they have been educated, and to assert their right to free discussion, with their husbands and sons. Alas ! Sir, very few of us are suffered to discuss upon political subjects, or any thing else; I am confident there must be a great reformation in husbands, as well as the government, before we can obtain our rights in free discussion with them or our sons. How is it possible we should become politicians or philosophers, or acquire useful knowledge, when they are at the alehouse till midnight, and then return home without saying a word to us ? Give me the man who can improve himself with his family. There is happiness, or at least there ought to be ; but, Sir, I fear it is only in the cottage: I was in the country a few weeks for my health, when your words came across my mind, for in the cottage where I took lodgings, I saw it, and in every cottage I went into there was happiness, far different from what is found in London. Here is nothing but a scene of drunkenness and riot for wives in general, happy should I be if I could be like the cottager's wife ; for there is real comfort. But when I think of your wife's suffering, with your sister and self, the persecution you have all met with, I think every female in this country ought to come forward to support you in paying your enormous fines. Happy should I be, if I could call them together in your behalf, I am sorry to say, they seem frightened when I name you, on account of your religious principles, though at the same time acknowledge there are improper chapters in the Bible, which you have fully explained. Sir, if they make this their excuse for not coming forward to assist you, surely the females of London have a heart and hand to assist a suffering

female, she cannot have given offence in assisting an injured brother and sister. No, impossible, let us all come forward and pay her fine independent of our husbands; for God's sake do not let us see our own sex trampled down by a government, that ought to have protected her in such a cause. But those who persecuted you all in the manner they have done, can never lay down with so happy a mind as you do in a prison. Sir, believe me, if it was possible I could call the females of London together I would do it, but I am sure they will never see your injured sister lay in prison for want of that fine being paid! If they do, I shall blush for my sex as long as I live. They must never boast of their humanity and benevolence more. If your sister's cause will not rouse us from our slumbers to declare our independence, it is no matter how much we are trampled on by the government. I again call upon them to come forward and nobly pay her fine, and show our Sovereign what the females of England can do: believe me, Sir, I am sincerely sorry for your sister, and especially your wife, knowing she will be left in a miserable prison alone, but I hope she will retain the same fortitude as she has done all along. I herewith send your sister £1. 7s. I have collected for her. And remain your friend and well wisher, praying you may overcome your enemies.

MARY GREGORY.

	s. d.		s. d.
Mary Gregory	2 6	A Friend to the Distressed	1 0
Her Sister	2 6	A Tradesman	1 0
Mrs. L.	2 0	Nabob	1 0
A feeling Heart	3 0	Miss Geesin	3 0
A. Jackson	1 0	Sarah Ashford	1 9
A. Foot	1 0	Fanny Peak	1 6
Miss B.	1 0	Miss Bucher	1 3
Mrs. Bean	1 0	Miss Warham	0 .0

Mr. Carlile and his Sister are now both prisoners on account of their fines, after all the robberies that have been committed upon him on the pretence of securing their payment. It now remains for the men and women of this Island to shew whether the cause of free discussion on all subjects be a cause worth supporting, or whether it be of less consequence than their ordinary amusements, appearances, and pastimes.

BERKLEY, GEORGE, BISHOP OF CLOYNE, 1733,
BORN 1684.

(*Extract from the Encyclopedia Londinensis.*)

“ABOUT this time he engaged in a controversy with the mathematicians which made a great deal of noise in the literary world; and the occasion of it is said to have been this: Mr. Addison had given

the Bishop an account of their common friend Dr. Garth's behaviour in his last illness, which was equally displeasing to both these advocates of revealed religion; for when Addison went to see the Doctor, and began to discourse with him seriously about another world. 'Surely Addison,' replied he, 'I have good reason not to believe those trifles, since my friend, Dr. Halley, who has dealt so much in demonstration, has assured me that the doctrines of Christianity are incomprehensible, and the religion itself an imposture.' The Bishop therefore addressed to him, as to an infidel mathematician, a discourse called 'The Analyst,' with a view of shewing that mysteries in faith were unjustly objected to by mathematicians, who admitted much greater mysteries; and even falsehoods in science, of which he endeavoured to prove, that the doctrine of fluxions furnished a clear example."

OBSERVATIONS BY R. CARLILE.

BISHOP BERKLEY was a man of an astonishing power of mind in one respect, or in contending that the whole of what we call nature was a mystery. He contended that man knew nothing of matter or substance, upon the principle that intelligence was a thing confined to the mind of man, and that all that man could boast of was that he had ideas, and that beyond this he could prove nothing, nor be certain of the existence of any thing, though it was a chair or table on which he might sit, and at which he might write. His argument may be thus instanced: that if a man was sitting on a chair which he felt to support him, and which he might see if he chose, that he had no knowledge that a chair did exist or support him, but that he only knew that he had an idea of such a thing. He not only asserted that man knew nothing separate from himself or his ideas, but that he was not certain of his own existence, or that he had a mere unproved idea of being. Notwithstanding this extreme of scepticism upon every thing connected with the material world, this same Bishop would argue, like another priest, for the existence of a God, and for the necessity of believing all the Christian mysteries. He would deny us the use of our senses, or a dependence upon them in matters where the most positive proofs could be had, but where no proof in any degree could be obtained, there he demanded unlimited credence! His object was to confute the Materialists of his day; but the arguments he used told with ten times more force against his own system of belief, than

against the existences which operate upon all our senses. If a man put his hand in the fire, the Bishop would tell him that he had then no knowledge of the quality of fire distinct from his sensations, that it was a mere idea without proof, and so on. That if a man saw a post, felt it, hewed it down, and consumed it by fire, he had then no proof that the post, at any period of his action upon it was a real existence, but a mere optical or sensitive illusion. Yet this man has found disciples! I grant that his analytical stile of reasoning is useful to a certain degree as an exercise for the mind, and a means of habituating it to rely upon nothing but demonstrative proofs, but to tell us that we know nothing, and never can know any thing, but what the priests teach us, is a doctrine as absurd as it is corrupt and mischievous. It is just like telling us that we have no real sensations, and that we may as well lay down and perish as exert ourselves to live.

The slightest view of the Bishop's thesis is sufficient to show the poorest capacity that religion has no foundation whatever; for, if we are not to believe our eyes or other sensations when acted upon by material objects, pray, all ye Bishops and Priests, what ground have we to trust you in your doctrines about spiritualities, immaterialities, and mere fictions of your minds?

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

WORTHY CITIZEN,

Manchester, Nov. 18, 1822.

THIS comes with the congratulations of myself and fellow Republicans of Manchester on the termination of the vindictive and tyrannical sentence which you have suffered for advocating the cause of truth, reason, and liberty. In behalf of the subscribers I request you to accept the sum of £8. 11s. 4d. towards enabling you to settle the unjust fines imposed upon you. These fines were imposed for three reasons: First, To satisfy the ambition of tyrants, and quench the fears of priests; Secondly, To frighten those that were timid; unestablished in their principles, and if possible to bring them back again to be crammed with delusion and superstition, or kingcraft and priestcraft:—and Thirdly, That you might remain in prison during the period of your life for want of the means to satisfy the extortions of those monsters calling themselves Christians. But, instead of the persecutions, imprisonments, and robberies committed upon you, under pretence of fines, having the effect for which the tyrants and priests intended them, they have had just the contrary; for you, Sir, by your firm, bold, heroic, and persevering conduct, have made the tyrants tremble. The Devil and the gates of Hell

cannot subdue the priests and their holy religion; therefore, he may go about seeking whom he may devour; but it is evident that they dread you more than the devil, for you have they put in prison, and robbed under a pretence of supporting the will of God. It may be argued here, that the priests have not the power to bind the devil; but I assert, that if the Bible be true, they have, for Christ says, wherever two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them; and whatever they ask shall be granted.

Now, if the priests believe this saying, and if they believe the devil to be their enemy; as they have assembled together by hundreds, why have they not got the devil either destroyed or bound down? The reason is obvious, the priests cannot do without a devil, no more than I can exist without breath; priestcraft and kingcraft are inseparably united. I, myself, have been the dupe of priests, and a passive slave to tyrants, and I assert, that priests are the manufacturers of the first link of the chain of oppression. So long as the priests have the power to preach passive obedience and non-resistance, so long as their dupes believe it their duty to submit with patience to the will of tyrants; so long will injustice be practised on the people.

But you, Sir, have laid the axe to the root of the tree. You have endeavoured to chop up corruption by the roots. You have disappointed the expectations of tyrants, and increased the fears of priests; for those that were timid and unestablished, you, by your conduct and pen have confirmed in their opinion.

Thousands that were in the gall of superstition and prejudice have you brought to the light of truth and reason; and as the two first reasons are frustrated; so also will the third; yet every truly liberal-minded man must feel a degree of shame and sorrow that there was not patriotism enough to be found in our land; to have sent you the means to have settled your fines to the day. No man feels more on this subject than myself; yet when I consider the progress that knowledge is making in the minds of the people, when I consider the vast number that have been added to the standard of right principles; and when I view the large increase of contributors to your fines, I see great cause to rejoice at the victory we have gained through your instrumentality and sufferings. I must now conclude by wishing you to go on and prosper; and destroy the strong holds of superstition and ignorance; for so long as you remain found on the rock of principle on which you now rest, not all the batteries of tyrants, nor all the tub-thumping priests; No, nor all the pretended friends to liberty, which will see a man persecuted for opinion, and for advocating free discussion without coming to his assistance can prevail against you; I assure you that the Republicans of Manchester will not desist from subscribing till the whole of your fines are paid, whether you are in or out of prison.

I remain, in behalf of the whole, your fellow sufferer in the bonds of oppression.

CHARLES NASEBY.

Subscriptions from Manchester.

James Thompson's Subscription.

	s.	d.
John Gratrix	5	0
First but wont be the last	1	0
John Gradwell	2	6
James Thomson	2	6
Charles Thomson	2	6
Rachel Thomson	1	6
Hard Peter	1	0
Thomas Cope	1	0
Samuel Hulme	1	0
Matthew Carter	1	0
A Dairymaid	1	0
John Chorlton	1	6
Joseph Chorlton	1	6
Mary Walker	1	0
Thomas Owen	1	0
James Wheeler	2	0
William Campion	2	0
Samuel Kenyon	1	6
James Beswick	2	0
An Enemy to Priestcraft	0	6
Robert Robinson	1	0
Adam Booth	1	0
Mary Ann Rhodes, daughter to Joseph Rhodes, who is now confined in Giltspur Street Compter for the Glory of God and the Honour of Revealed Religion	1	0
William Simmon's	1	0
True Republican	1	0
James Boyle	1	0
James Carruthers	1	6
George Jackson	0	6
John Clayton	0	6
John Chell	1	0
An Enemy to Black Cloth	1	0
Thomas Proudlove	0	6
Robert Aspinal	1	0
James Rushton	1	0
William Ellis	1	0
Isaac Beadle	0	6
James Johnson	0	6
James Sorton	0	6
James Smith	0	6
John Ogden	0	6
Richard Andrew	0	6
James Clayton	0	6
James Johnson	0	6
William Carden	1	0
John Ashburn	1	0
Henry Brickill	0	6
John Boothright	0	6
Richard Arnold	0	6
John Taylor	0	6
Thomas Walker	1	0
James Longshaw	1	0
John Thomson	1	0
Edward Moorland	1	0
Robert Turner	0	6
John Smith	0	6
Peter Johnson	1	0
James Hartley	0	6
Thomas Dewsnap	0	6
James Hoyle	0	6
William Johnson	0	6
Robert Scade	0	6
John Davies	0	6
James Weddows	0	6
Charles Gardner	0	6

Two or three Friends from the Higher Regions.

	s.	d.
An Enemy to Persecution	1	0
Richard Coaksan	1	0
James Carden	0	6
Collected by Citizen John Bottomley, for the use of the bravest of the brave.		
Citizen John Bottomley	1	0
S. W. a Deist and Republican	2	0
Thomas Dickinson	1	0
J. M. a Freethinker	1	0
William Williams	0	6
Laurence Molineux	1	0
One who laughs at the foolish notion that no one can be a true Republican except he be a Materialist	5	0
A looker on at Peterloo, and has not forgot it yet	1	0
Edward Jones	2	0
Joseph Haygate	2	0
John Beaty, who will continue to subscribe his mite towards the unjust fines imposed on Richard Carlile by the Enemies of all Mankind, while there remains one shilling unpaid	2	6
An Enemy to the black Slugs that devour the tenth of every man's labour	5	0
John Woodward	1	0
R. L.	1	0
T. H.	1	0
G. W. Rawson and his Friend	2	0
Tom Nobody	1	0
J. Whitaker	1	0
A. Eastwood a Priest hater	1	0
As it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be world without end, Amen	1	0
H. F., fourth time	2	0
Charles Naseby, Sen.	1	0
Charles Naseby, Jun.	1	0
Benjamin Howard	1	0
Nathan Massey	1	0
Nathan Walker	0	6
Mrs. Baker	2	6
Absalom Leach	0	3
A black Deist	1	0
John Ashworth	1	0
A Female Deist and Republican, though young	0	6
A Female Deist and Republican though I have only fourteen children	0	6
Citizen Ellen Bottomley	0	3
J. M., an Old Deist of upwards of twenty years.	2	6

Received at James Wheeler's, No. 3, Cotton Street, George Leigh Street.

	s.	d.
John Greenwood	1	0
J. Dean	2	6
E. Hutchfield	2	6
John Haslum, Sen.	0	6
John Haslum, Jun.	0	6
C. Hargraves	2	6
Thomas Murray	1	0
William Topham	1	0
Death-bed Confessions	0	6
A Friend to all true Reformers	2	0
Charles Aberdean	1	6
James Miller	1	0
Arthur Irwin	2	0
W. B.	0	6
I. W.	0	6
Jonathan Leach	1	0
Joseph Tilford	5	0
William Carden	1	0
Thomas Paine	1	0
John Walton	0	6
William Hume	1	0
J. F. an Enemy to Priestcraft	1	0
Fredrick Falkner	1	0
J. M. a Friend to Humanity	1	0
S. Higginson	0	1
A Wounded Pig	1	0
Moses Mills	1	0
Edward Langton	1	0
William Jones	1	0
William Brady	1	0
C. R.	0	6
Collected at Citizen Walkers', 9, Back Piccadilly, Manchester.		
From the Reading Society held at Citizen Walkers	6	6
H. D.	0	6
J. F.	0	6
One that is surprised at the Bishop of Clogher being at hard work	1	0
Robert Hurst	1	0
Richard Moore	0	6
Samuel Barrow	1	0
William Gladstone	1	0
John Brimstone thinks it his duty to relieve all incarcerated Friends	1	0
Samuel Booth, an Enemy to the detestable Bishop of Clogher	1	0
John Stafford	1	0
J. Q.	0	3
Robert Smith, an admirer of the works of Nature; but a hater of the Bishop of Clogher and Soldier, and also a hater of all who live in idleness and destroy the fruits of other mens' labour	1	0
John Clark of Falsworth	1	0

KNOCK DOWN ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF CHRISTIANITY,

The boast of those who are horrified at the Phantom they call Blasphemy!!!

THE following paragraph appeared in the Morning Post of Friday, the 15th instant, and doubtless will be considered a fit subject to be copied into all the Christian newspapers. We are authorized to say, on the part of the person who keeps the shop in Waterloo Road for the sale of Mr. Carlyle's publications, that as far as the paragraph relates to him, it is utterly false, and his first knowledge of the matter was from its appearance in the "Lying Christian Royal Post."

"A fight took place on Wednesday evening, in the Waterloo Bridge Road, between a disciple of Carlyle (who has lately opened another Mart of Sedition in that neighbourhood) and a working man. The quarrel arose in consequence of the former using some irreligious expressions, which led to angry words, and finally to blows. The contest, however, did not last long, for a severe blow put in on the mouth of 'The Deist' settled the business in favour of 'The Christian,' who advised his fallen adversary to be more cautious in future in assertions he could not support."

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Paris, October 16, 1822.

I THINK you would render a service of importance to Republicans, if you were to republish in one of your future numbers, Mill's *Essay on Government*, published last year in the 9th volume of the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, and if you should think it proper to add some practical notes from the actual American Government. Freret's *Observations on the Ark of Noe and the Deluge*, deserve likewise an English dress in your Republican; from the dimensions of the vessel mentioned in the Old Testament, it is impossible, that the tigers, lions, wolves, &c. (a pair of each) could have been fed, as well as elephants, rhinoceros's, and other large herbivorous animals, from the limited stores of the vessel. I find, that you, with other Englishmen, fall into the constant mistake of attributing the Sys-

No. 27, Vol. VI.

teme de la Nature to Mirabeau (or, as you wrongly spell, *Mirabaud*) who never wrote any thing against religion. The author of this book is *Baron d'Holbach*, whose widow, I believe, is still alive at Paris; the same Baron published at the same time the most excellent moral code of unbelievers under the title of *Système Social*, in three small volumes 8vo. He also published another useful work, intitled *Ethocratie*, 1 vol. and another *Politique Naturelle*, 2 vols. 8vo. is also attributed to him; this much esteemed philosopher was the intimate friend of Diderot, D'Alembert, Helvetius, &c. and his house was for a number of years the rendezvous of all enlightened men in this country.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Leeds, November 13, 1822.

ESTEEMED FRIEND AND FELLOW CITIZEN,
THE time which has elapsed since our last remittance will perhaps have led you to think that we have suffered an apathy to seize upon us, or have fallen into a careless indifference, and a neglect of one of the most sacred duties which ever men had to perform.

The best means I know of to rid the earth of such monsters as oppress us is to keep a press unshackled, that the Rights of Man may be made known in every city, town, and hamlet in the world, and even to the wandering tribes which have no settled place of abode, and that the sentiments of all may respond to each other. Let the political principles of Thomas Paine be made known, and they will be sure to be adopted, for they no sooner become known than they are seen to be calculated to promote the welfare and happiness of all. The only means which I see at present of maintaining a free press is to give you such support as will enable you not only to bear up against, but to beat down, such a phalanx of vice, infamy, and corruption, as was never concentrated in any set of monsters called men before. If our apparent neglect has led you or any other Republicans to think the Republicans of Leeds remiss in so sacred a duty, I hope they will remove the suspicion by more speedy remittances in future; for, I think, it is much to be regretted that any thing like apathy should pervade any portion of men professing to be Republicans, convinced as they must be of the superiority of the principles they advocate over those which are opposed to them, particularly, when we see with what assiduity and perseverance the enemies of truth, reason, and justice, labour to keep the useful and industrious part of mankind in mental and bodily slavery; well knowing that if they can enslave the mind, the body will be a sure and easy prey. Then let me earnestly call upon all the honest and

virtuous part of the public to step forward on the present occasion with their mites, and thwart the fiends, in their project for keeping Mr. Carlyle and family dungeonized for life. But more particularly let me intreat the Republicans of Leeds boldly and manfully to step forward and exert themselves in so humane, so noble a cause, and not relax or suffer their ardour to abate for one moment, but as they were amongst the first publicly to declare their approval of your conduct and identify themselves with you, to follow it up by giving you a full share of their support, for I hope there is not a Republican in the country who will cease to subscribe whatever he or she may be able, till the whole amount of your and your sister's fines be paid. Should they not live to see the objects accomplished for which they are contending, they will have the satisfaction of having done their duty.

I think almost all the political evils with which society is afflicted, may be attributed to two predominating principles in man: namely, sycophancy on the one hand, and tyranny on the other; the former being the fosterer of the latter and both are the natural offspring of that prolific monster religion! Children, in general, from the first moment of their being born are taught to believe in a tyrant, who is not to be appeased but by flattery, fawning sycophancy, and a prostration of mind and body without knowing in what they have offended. Nay, they are taught, that without this, they will be doomed to everlasting torments, even should their whole lives be blameless and without reproach. The first thing which is taught them being to make themselves servile and mean, it destroys all the nobleness and independency of the mind. The most servile and mean are always the most tyrannical, and no sooner do such characters find that they have an opportunity of exercising their tyranny, than they begin to display the fiend-like principle which they have kept concealed under the mask of hypocrisy, by oppressing and inflicting the most cruel tortures on all who do not pay implicit obedience to their capricious will, and thus act like the malignant monster of their imagination—their God.

I hope there are a sufficient number of enlightened and liberal minded Republicans in this country, to enable you, through their support to continue to publish those wholesome truths, and make known those principles of Republicanism which are like poisoned arrows to priests and kings, that you and your family may live to see this most desirable object accomplished and all your wrongs redressed, is the sincere wish of

Your Friend and Fellow Citizen,
JOSEPH HURTLEY.

P.S. With this I shall transmit £11. 12s. being the amount of the present subscription in Leeds; and £1. 4s. from Millbridge, the subscription of twenty-four Republicans whose address you have received.

Subscription from Leeds.

	s. d.		s. d.		s. d.
Joseph Wasse	1 0	Henry Hall	0 6	D. M.	0 6
Thomas Steel	2 0	A Friend to Liberty	0 6	Joseph Oxley	0 6
Brickdust	2 6	A Friend to Truth	0 6	Benjamin Ingham	1 0
Frances Buckle, a De- tector of Calumny	1 6	John Haynsley, friend to Free Discussion	1 0	J. Worsnap	1 0
Joseph Taylor	0 6	John Walsh, from the Sale of Judge Bai- ley's Prayer Book	2 0	A. B.	1 6
Bentley James	1 3	Atheist and Deist	0 6	William Collinson	0 3
Friend T.	0 6	S. P.	0 6	U. N.	1 0
Under the Red Tree	0 2	For reading "The Re- publican"	3 0	Moses Townsend	0 6
William Wilson	1 4	G. L.	0 6	J. Sykes	0 3
Jonathan Thompson	0 6	Thomas Lindley	1 0	William Burn	0 3
Denvy, one who wishes to see the Seed of the Woman bruise the Tyrants' head	0 4	Thomas Evans	1 0	William Hardeastle, a Friend to Liberty	1 6
William Atkinson	2 0	William Parkinson	0 6	<i>By Mr. Brayshaw.</i>	
Marmaduke Wormald	2 0	Crispin Luty	0 6	S. Lawson Rawden	1 0
John Ramsden	2 6	John Hobson	0 6	J. Grayson, Yeaden	0 6
Martin Metcalf	0 4	J. H.	1 0	M. D. Do.	0 6
Thomas Maltby, Pudsey	3 9	Welcome	1 0	James Watson, Guiseley	0 6
Joseph Shires	1 6	James Goldthorp	1 0	Scott	0 3
William Collinson	0 6	Father, Son, and Holy Ghost	0 6	Mr. Midgeley, Horsforth	1 0
William Birley	1 0	A. Barrowclough	0 6	J. Murgatroy	0 3
A Female Friend	0 3	James Graham	0 6	J. B.	10 0
James Longbottom	3 0	John Warburton	0 3	J. E.	3 0
Joseph Bentley	0 6	Jaines Jobbing	0 3	William Baxter	0 3
D. W.	4 0	Isaac Holmes	0 6	J. B. by D.	1 0
John Pirkins	1 6	Isaac Dean	0 3	John Ripley	2 0
George Hodgson	1 0	A Friend	0 3	Allice Ingham who had rather see a Bishop holding a Plough than play with a Sol- dier	
John Kepworth	0 6	James Robertson	1 0	W. C.	0 6
Joseph Hague	0 6	Benjamin Bywater	0 3	R. W. Byerley, Mate- rialist	5 0
George Lee	2 0	Benjamin Parker	0 3	Joseph Hurtley	4 0
M. E. a Female Friend to Free Discussion	1 0	Richard France	0 3	George Dovener	1 0
John Jones	0 6	Honesty	0 6	Ann Wood	0 6
William Bish	2 0	James Andrews	0 6	Arthur Hannah	0 6
Hartley Smith	2 6	Robert Nelson	0 6	Mrs. Sledding	0 2
Benjamin Moorhouse, Driglington	0 4	H. George	0 6	James Warburton	5 0
Mr. Richard Wright, Republican, Stock- ton upon Tees, an Enemy to Priestcraft and Kingcraft	2 6	William Vary	2 0	William Fieldhouse	0 6
J. B.	0 6	William Ellis	1 0	John Coates, a Natural- ist, Stokesley	1 1
Samuel Ingham	2 6	Richard Sutton	0 6	Joseph Harley	2 0
J. B.	2 6	J. W.	0 6	John Green	1 6
Surplus of a Subscrip- tion to pay for H. Boyle's parcel	0 7	Hannah Bracewell	0 6	Joseph Hirst	0 6
Mr. Watson	1 0	Robert Walker, a Friend to Truth	1 0	Joseph Stoney	0 6
Joseph Mitchel Kippas	1 6	William Gains	0 3	John Lindley	0 3
William Kirk	1 6	Joseph Burrow, a Friend to Justice	0 6	Mary Denvy	3 0
J. L.	0 6	James Barker	0 3	William Sharp, an Ene- my to Tyrants and all Oppressors	1 0
John Wood	1 6	Joseph Marsden	0 6	John Mirfield	0 6
Joseph Gill	7 6	William Coates, a Friend to Liberty	0 6	Herrings and Greens, a Friend, by John Smithson	5 0
Joseph Oates	4 0	Dan	0 6	William Brown, a Friend to Humanity	1 0
Charles Button	2 6	James	0 6	The "Manchester Ob- server" is gone down, and "The Junta of Six" are at their post, John Smithson, a Materialist	10 0
A Republican from Wortley	1 0	Jonah in the Whale's belly	1 0	William Driver of Leeds, another of "The Junta of Six," and the person who received Blows for argument from "that real true-hearted Ra- dical, Mr. Joseph Wasse"	10 0
Peter Walker	5 0	Thomas Hallewell	1 0	J. Kirk, Atheist	1 6
J. C., an Enemy to Priestcraft, and all tyranizing power	1 0	John Shepherd	0 6	John Castles	0 3
George Spurr	3 0	James Clark	1 0	Matthew Joy	0 6
W. V.	1 0	A Friend	0 6		
Duke Hatfield	2 6	No Friend to excessive Punishment	0 6		
Thomas Bulmer	0 6	H. H.	0 6		
James Scoblefield	0 6	Edward Booth	1 0		
Mr. Scoblefield	1 0	Joseph Driver	2 6		
Abram Clipp	0 3	An Enemy to Soul Tink- ers	1 0		
Robert Pearson, Trans- lator	0 6	Universal Citizenship	4 0		
Peter Pollard, an Ene- my to Tyrants	1 6	Joseph Frith	0 6		
William Warr	5 0	William Battey	0 6		
J. Hewson	2 6	James Ryley	0 6		
		Friend to Civil and Re- ligious Liberty	0 6		
		E. Draw	1 0		
		John Dovener	1 0		
		John Foster	0 6		

Received by the Leeds Parcel of James Penny, the sum of £1. 4s. being a Subscription of 1s. each from the Twenty-four Republicans who met at Millbridge, on the 20th of October, 1822, to follow the example of the brave Republicans of Manchester.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR AND REVERED SIR,

Oldham, Nov. 9, 1822.

It is with feelings of the greatest pleasure that I take the opportunity of writing in behalf of the Republicans of Oldham, to request you will accept the sum of Four Pounds, the better to enable you to combat the tyrants in power, and which you so richly merit. They are likewise glad that the completion of the time is at hand that your Christian persecutors so wantonly ordered you to spend in a Gaol. To inflict a period of three years imprisonment and fifteen hundred pounds as fines, is one of those traits which predominate so conspicuously in the characters of the meek and lowly Christians. Is this the only resource they had? This their argument to convince the more sensible part of the community? Let their church answer. Now, in my opinion, by incarcerating the man whom they have sought to make the victim of their rage, they have not only paralysed their craft and sophistry by so doing, but their doctrines will henceforth be considered as nothing but a cheat and delusion, and the book called the Bible nothing but a string of contradictions, falsehood and lies. If the Bible be true, as their church says, from whence proceeds all their fears; whence all those arrestations of the men taken from Mr. Carlile's shop, the prosecutions of which are attended with such enormous expense? Surely, they have arrived at the climax of madness or they would have perceived that the efforts made in this way greatly assist in the destruction of that hydra which has been the scourge and curse of so many nations for so many centuries. It is shocking, when the mind calmly contemplates the nature of things, if a man is but endowed with ordinary ability, and that ability but ordinarily exercised, to consider to what a degree Arts and Sciences have arrived, and then contrast it with the religious dogmas, not only of this country, but in all other countries where Priests and Kings, have reared their hideous heads. We shall most certainly from such contemplations be actuated by motives for the destruction of those dogmas? Mr. Paine, truly says, that there are but few men that are bold enough to be honest or honest enough to be bold, but at the close of the eighteenth century, he wrote in direct opposition to the Bible, exposing its errors and fraud by bringing proof against the Bible from the Bible itself, and set the proper example. This I believe was the first direct attack made by any Englishman.

But since that period there are others who have exposed its errors and frauds, amongst whom you have been the bravest and most fearless. You have not only published the Age of Reason in its parts, but have given publicity to other deistical works that were but little known. How it happened that until the time of the French Revolution an investigation of the Bible had not taken place, I am at a loss to determine, but very probably the necessity was not so pressing prior to that period as it has been since. The abuse in Church and State, united for the fulfilment and the accomplishment of the designs of those monsters in power, to rob and plunder the public, have appeared more clear since the period of the French Revolution than before. The craft, the trickery, the impositions, the frauds of these demagogues were then hurled from the womb of darkness before the eyes of an half-starved and dying people. Such a tissue of crimes were developed, as never before that period was recorded in the annals of history. Having all this before us, it became a paramount duty in us to continue the investigation, to detect imposition, and to expose its terrific and hideous features to the unwary and unthinking part of the community ; and, finally, if possible, to arrive at a goal from whence we may commence a new era of government, that may treat us with more humanity. Permit me to say, Mr. Carlile, without flattery or adulation, that, it is to you in a superlative degree that the country is indebted for knowledge in these matters. For my own part I have for many years viewed things in the light that you now write in, and I grow more confirmed in the belief of it. There never did, there does not, there never will arrive a time that any book, let that book bear what name it may, can pass for the word of God. We very often use the word *God*, but let a man say what sort of archetype presents itself to the mind when he uses the word. No two people upon earth think alike in this respect, therefore, as nothing tangible offers itself, whereby we can be justified in saying what *God* is, as no two people think similar, it is unnecessary to attempt to give a definition. Let us content ourselves then by exploring as far as in us lays the various modifications and combinations of matter. They teach us no falsehood; they will teach us no miracle, nor will they even teach us that there is an effect without a cause. Had there been but a few men thirty years ago, possessing the same spirit and talents which you possess, there is but little doubt that we should have known little of the tyranny of the priesthood; a tyranny that surpasses all other tyrannies upon the earth, inasmuch as it not only enslaves the minds of its dupes and votaries whilst here, but holds out its horrors and threats for a punishment hereafter. Had the principles of the immortal Mirabaud been published extensively, and explained thirty years since and continued until now, the Priests of all denominations would have been less respected than what they now are. My grateful respects are due to your wife and your sister who have assisted so much in the cause of freedom towards emancipating the mind from the trammels of superstition and bigotry.

I have thought proper to transmit to you a list of the subscribers

names some of whom have been subscribers to all the money which you have received, others only to the present subscription, you will see by this list that our cause is getting ground in this part of the world.

I conclude your friend and well-wisher in Liberty's cause.

JOSHUA KERSHAW.

As the sums subscribed by the old subscribers are not set forth, with their names, we merely give the names and sums of the new subscribers.

EDITOR.

	s. d.		s. d.
T. W.	0 6	J. N.	0 6
T. H.	0 3	W. K.	0 3
H. K.	0 3	J. C.	0 6
S. K.	0 6	Received from Water-head-mill	8 4
J. S.	0 6	T. M.	1 0
J. G.	0 3	An Enemy to Persecution	0 6
S. M.	1 0	Robert Newton, a Materialist	1 0
R. T.	0 3	One that is emancipated from the trammels of Superstition by the exertions of Richard Carlile	1 0
E. N.	0 6	J. H.	1 0
Joseph Fletcher	1 0	J. P.	1 0
J. T.	1 6	J. T.	0 3
J. H.	1 0	J. S.	1 0
A. W.	0 6	A Friend	1 0
A. T.	0 3	John Bailey	1 0
T. T.	0 3	A Friend	1 5
J. D.	1 0	J. W.	1 0
J. S.	0 6		
E. J.	1 0		
Jump	0 3		

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR CITIZEN,

Deptford, Nov. 20, 1822.

INCLOSED is an account of the mites of a few friends at Deptford, towards liquidating the cruel and oppressive fines imposed on you. I have given the amount to your shopman in Union Street. You will be so good as notice the receipt of them in "The Republican," it would have been more, but several of your friends of this place had attended the meeting at Cateaton Street, and did there subscribe. Times are really so bad with the industrious classes here, few can spare much, but, at the same time, I am happy to say, those who have here given, gave it with the greatest pleasure; we are all proud to see your friends increase, but at the same time are sorry to see you still incarcerated for want of your fines being paid. However, looking at the vast magnitude of the object at which you aim

(emancipation of mind as well as body) I cease to wonder so few are found to avow and support their sentiments.

Wishing you, your Wife and Sister, all possible peace and comfort, I subscribe myself your admirer,

JOHN HENDERSON.

	s. d.		s. d.
John Henderson	10 0	James Hodges	2 6
Maurice John Troy	5 0	Belfast Boot-maker	2 0
William Allen	5 0	James Tool	2 0
W. T. who like the Priests likes the good things of this world and will run the risk of the next.	5 0	Moses Phillips	2 0
Thomas Perry	5 0	Edward Whail	1 0
		Philip Neadly	1 0
		William Johnson	1 0

WHAT CONSTITUTES A VAGABOND?

SEVERAL friends have complained to me of the manner in which I noticed the Reverend Mr. Smith of Penzance. They say he is a man of very mild and gentlemanly manners, and a decided enemy to persecution for matters of opinion. I am also told that he is a regular reader of my publications and a preacher against the persecutions that have fallen upon myself and family.

But the question is, did he make such speeches at Hull, as were reported in "The Hull Advertiser"? If he did not, let him publicly say so. If he did I have proved him a liar, and being proved a liar who wanders about to deceive, constitutes him a vagabond. These are the only two epithets I applied to him, and on the fullest consideration, and after different accounts of the man, I not only am not disposed to retract what I wrote, but I have discovered a full justification of the matter. One friend has said that I did not treat the man and the subject philosophically. I know nothing of philosophy that is distinct from a detection and exposure of error and falsehood, and a plain and bold promulgation of truths. A *liar* is the proper name for the man who wilfully states what he knows to be false. A *vagabond* is the proper name of a man who wanders from place to place to deceive those who will listen to him, and who makes a trade and a living of deception, having no fixed residence, and no honest or useful employment. Such a character is the Reverend Mr. Smith of Penzance, and from the heads of a sermon that has been sent me, which he preached in (I believe) Silver Street Chapel, London, I think the man a detestable hypocrite.

R. CARLILE.

ISRAEL VINDICATED.

(Continued from Page 799.)

In England, and in Holland, where numerous bodies of Jews are settled, in consequence of more religious liberty being granted there than in the other European states, few criminals of our nation are to be found. "Scarcely (says the author of the *Letters of Certain Jews*) can one instance be given of a Portuguese Jew executed at Amsterdam, or the Hague, during two centuries." Can as much be said of the Christians in any country of the world? Even in the United States, where the criminal code is less sanguinary than it is in any other nation, do we not see persons frequently put to death for the most atrocious crimes; yet these men are not Jews, but professing to be Christians. Let the comparison be drawn in reference to any other country, and the result will be found equally honourable to our nation.

With regard to the people of Massachusetts, I perceive that they have decided on calling a convention, for the purpose of re-modelling their constitution, and it is not doubted, that the religious test will be there done away with. Some of the antiquated leading men in the state, among whom is a Judge Parker, have proclaimed hostility against this salutary modification; but as it appears from the public journals, that liberal and tolerant principles generally prevail in this part of the union, the efforts of these men to counteract the introduction of a judicious policy, which is dictated by the present advanced state of knowledge, must prove entirely abortive.

I confess, dear Isaacs, that I have hitherto been much deceived as to the boasted liberty of conscience enjoyed in this country. When I contemplated the language of the general constitution, which distinctly states, that every citizen is to be held eligible to fill public offices, without regard to his religious opinions, I had no idea that a principle, which all the states had recognised collectively as a leading bond of their union, could have been so easily invaded by *particular* states. Of what avail is it for congregated tribes to pledge themselves, in solemn convocation, to maintain the principles of universal toleration, when they assume to themselves, on this convocation being dissolved, the right to violate this sacred bond of union? They may attempt to shelter them-

selves under some pretence relative to the independence of the states taken separately, and the right they have by the general constitution, to enact their own laws. But if, in enacting these laws, they run counter to first principles, and, under the subterfuge of adhering to the *letter*, innovate upon the *spirit* of the original contract, they as effectually withhold their assent to the general constitution as if they had openly declared against it. First principles are invariable in all circumstances and in all situations. They admit of no qualification ; and whenever it is attempted, by sophistry or the cant of hypocrisy, to weaken or disguise their obvious meaning, we may then safely conclude, that interest and prejudice are predominant ; that mankind are hurried along by these inordinate feelings, instead of being guided by the torch of reason and of truth.

Nothing seems more obvious than the abuse of the word *toleration* :—this word ought, in fact, to be expunged from the vocabulary of nations. The right to *think* belongs to no one exclusively. It is the property of all. He that attempts to deprive me of that right, or to limit its exercise, meditates a controul of my actions. If it is once admitted, that I ought to submit my opinions to the regulations of others, there would be only one step farther to a total surrender of every civil right. He that pretends he has a right to *tolerate* opinions, must yield that right to others, or deny the natural equality of man. If *all* should insist that the power belongs to them, peace and concord would be banished from the earth, and war perpetuated, not to establish an uniformity, but an ascendancy of contradictory and opposing systems.

Had Jehovah intended to establish uniformity of opinion, it would have been impossible for mankind to differ. In all countries, and in all ages, the ideas of man have been as varied as their countenances—an evident proof that they never can be made to think alike. He, therefore, that attempts to regulate, or tolerate the opinion of others, sets himself in opposition to the Deity. A Jew has as good a right to tolerate a Catholic or Protestant as either of these sects has to tolerate a Jew. Both are equal in the eyes of God, and both have an equal claim to the protection of the laws.

It is only in despotic governments that these incontrovertible principles have not been adopted. It has been tyrants only, that have attempted to withhold from man the free exercise of his thinking faculties. The right of giving, clearly implies the power of withholding. If any man tells me that he will tolerate my opinions, this implies that he claims the

power of restraining them. Hence the origin of persecution, which is only the offspring or child of toleration.

Farewell, dear Isaacs; may you be blessed with a patient and forgiving spirit.

NATHAN JOSEPH.

LETTER XXX.

Same subject continued—Jews not immoral.

DEAR ISAACS,

FOR what purpose is it that indignities are heaped upon our nation by the Nazarenes? Do they think that the mind is to be convinced by compulsion, or by denying us our civil rights? Are they ignorant that the heart of man can never be brought to relish truth, if it is not presented in engaging colours? Is it by the scourge, or by offers of suitable rewards, that the pupil is prevailed on to listen to the precepts of his teacher? Although it were true, that the Nazarenes are in the right, the violent and tyrannical manner by which many of them announce their principles, and the contempt with which they treat the children of Abraham is calculated to prevent the reception of these principles, and to excite an unconquerable prejudice against a religion which aims at sovereign power, and seeks to convince by force rather than by reason.

Why should I despise another because he has not been educated as I have been? I think he is in error; he thinks the same of me. If we both err, it is unfair to attribute to obstinacy what has arisen entirely from our having had different teachers, and having read different books. When the high priest of Tamerlane urged him to reduce all the nations he had conquered, to one religion, that prince replied—"No, I will not; for how do I know, but the same God, who hath delighted himself so much with the variety which we see every where in nature, may not also delight himself as much in variety of worship?"

During those ancient periods in which the principle of compulsory tests was acted upon by sovereigns, we find only a history of schisms, heresies, and futile contests; of men, pretending to be saints, cutting each other's throats for opinions which they could not understand, and of princes fostering, sometimes on one side and sometimes on another, those bloody struggles, which intolerance excited among their sub-

jects. It was the opinions of the court only that were indulged: all others were condemned, and decrees issued to exterminate such as did not profess the established creed. The consequence of this was the total destruction of all morality. Men became hypocrites to preserve their lives and their estates, and he who was possessed of the greatest cunning, was always sure to supplant his opponents. The history of most European nations is a history of craft and intrigue, devised by hypocrites, whose power and existence depended solely on the ignorance of the multitude, whose minds they had previously enslaved by real and imaginary terrors. Good citizens can only be formed by equal laws. Legislation cannot reach beyond civil society. When it is attempted to carry it farther, it destroys the equality of right; it confounds the honest man with the hypocrite, and, instead of forming good citizens, it every where creates tyrants and slaves.

In no way is hypocrisy better fostered than in compelling men to submit to religious tests before they can be eligible to fill public offices. No one will pretend that the truly virtuous require the obligation of an oath, or religious tests, to restrain them from violating public or private trusts. Such tests are only for the wicked, whom, however, they never control. What advantages then can morality derive from, or what confidence can be placed in men, to whom the administering of an oath implies a suspicion of their integrity? Are we certain, that ambitious knaves will relinquish their iniquitous projects, merely because it is required of them to swear that they believe the doctrines, which they have been taught from their infancy to believe? Can power and emolument be obtained on easier terms? Is it possible to conceive a greater inducement to the unprincipled, to become candidates for the highest honours in the state? And what more powerful stimulant to their ambition, than to see the man of talent and of character, kept back from being useful to society, for no other reason than that he does not profess to believe what he cannot understand, or believing it, does not think that it would add greater weight to the truth, to appeal to that Being, who already knows the inmost secrets of his heart, and who, whether he swears truly or not, has not enabled man to judge as to his sincerity. How often do we find the most flaming professions of religion intimately connected with the most depraved hearts. The man who is bent only on promoting his own selfish views, will not hesitate at the means of obtaining his object. Aware that it is

necessary to disguise his sentiments, in his intercourse with his fellow-citizens, he will readily conform to their religious observances, without which he knows he cannot succeed. With such a man, the genuine ties of religion are of no account. He either disregards them altogether, or calculates on availing himself of their efficacy at some future period of his life. Where then is the advantage, either religious or political, of continuing tests? The good do not require them, and the wicked easily contrive to evade the purpose for which they are introduced.

It is constantly objected against our nation, that they are an abject, degraded race; actuated by no other principle than that of self; disposed to overreach others in their commercial transactions, and, at all times, bent on acquiring wealth, without regard to the means employed to obtain it. These charges have been so often reiterated, that most men credit them, without allowing themselves to reflect for a moment upon their truth or probability. It is in this, as it is in most other cases; men generally sit down contented with believing what has been taught them in their infancy, and which they have seldom, or never, heard contradicted. It is from this state of indolence that error is perpetuated, and that the odium, which has been attached to our nation, still exists. We are looked upon, even by many in this country, as a people undeserving the rights of citizens, and who ought to be debarred all social intercourse.

I have already shewn, that if the matter was candidly investigated, it would be found that the Jews, in almost every country, are as moral and correct in their general deportment as any other people. But admitting, that in some places of the world, they may be deserving of censure, can this be a matter of surprise, when it is notorious, that they are there deprived of all the privileges of citizens, despised, insulted, reviled, debased, and totally unacquainted with any thing but want and misery?—Can virtue and honour be expected to spring from such a soil? Can any sense of shame exist where guilt is preceded by treatment calculated to destroy every moral feeling? To cover the innocent with ignominy, is to pave the way to it. “So many laws (observes the Abbe Grégoire*) made against the Jews, always suppose in them a natural worthlessness; but these laws, which are the *fruit of hatred or prejudice, have no other foundation but the motive which gives rise to them.* We see talents and virtues

* Physical, Moral and Political Reformation of the Jews, p. 135.

shine forth in them wherever they begin to be treated as men." This enlightened Nazarene, although a priest of the most intolerant of all the Christian sects, was not ashamed to avow that slavery debased human nature; that whenever a man is excluded from participating in the rights and privileges of his fellow-citizens, he becomes degraded in his own estimation; loses all sense of moral duty; and seeks to revenge himself for the wrongs he suffers; by committing depredations upon society. Notwithstanding the correctness of these principles, the same intelligent writer acquits our nation of having been guilty of aggravated crimes: "We see few of them (says he) commit murder, or other enormous crimes, that call forth public vengeance*."

Adieu, dear Isaacs; may the God of our fathers continue to bless and prosper you.

NATHAN JOSEPH.

LETTER XXXI.

The Abbe Grégoire and Benjamin Franklin, Friends of Toleration—
Parable against Persecution.

DEAR ISAACS,

THE Abbe Grégoire, of whom you wish me to give you some farther information, was a member of the Royal Society of Arts and Sciences at Metz, and of the National Assembly of France. The learned society of Metz having offered a premium for the best essay on the physical, moral, and political reformation of our nation, the prize was awarded to Grégoire, whose labours can never be too highly appreciated by the descendants of Abraham. They do as much honour, as the English translator of his work remarks, to his head as to his heart, and equally display the warmth of his benevolence, and the extent of his learning. Would to God that the example of this philanthropist and scholar was followed by men of the present day, who, like him, have it in their power, from the sacred characters which they hold, to inculcate toleration and universal benevolence. After vindicating our nation from the odium which has been heaped upon them for upwards of eighteen hundred years, and clearly demonstrating our right to participate in the privileges enjoyed by every citizen or subject under those governments where chance or circumstances may

* Physical, Moral and Political Reformation of the Jews, p. 134.

have placed us, the benevolent Abbe concludes his interesting work with the following eloquent and impressive appeal:—

“ O! nations; for eighteen centuries ye have been treading under foot the remains of Israel. Divine vengeance hath displayed its severity against them; but have you been commissioned to be the instruments of it?—The fury of your fathers selected their victims from this deserted flock; what treatment do you reserve for the timid lambs who have escaped the slaughter, and taken shelter in your bosoms? Is it enough to leave them life, while you deprive them of every thing that can render it desirable? Will your hatred form a part of the inheritance which you bequeath to your children? No longer judge of this nation except for the future; but if you again review the past crimes, and the present corruption of the Jews, let it be in order to lament *your own work*. Being the *cause* of their vices, become that also of their virtues; discharge your debt, and that of your ancestors.

“ A new age is about to commence. Let the palms of humanity adorn its front; and let posterity, by anticipation, applaud the junction of your hearts. The Jews are members of that universal family which ought to establish fraternity among all nations; and over them, as well as us, revelation extends its majestic veil. Children of the same Father, leave no pretence for the aversion of your brethren, who will one day be united with you in the same sheep-fold. Open asylums where they may dry up their tears, and repose their heads in peace. In short, let the Jew, loving the Christian with reciprocal affection, embrace in me his fellow-citizen and his friend*.”

(To be continued.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

More letters with subscriptions have arrived than we shall be able to print this week. Mr. Carlile and his Sister are still detained for their fines! Considering the robberies that have been made upon his property this single fact stamps the ministers, and the Judges of the Court of King's Bench, as a

* Grégoire's Reformation of the Jews, pp. 239, 240.

COMPLETE BANDITI. If his property was not fit for them to sell it was not too fit for them to seize. They were legally bound to make sale of it in that manner which should have produced the greatest sum of money, and if it had been sold on the premises, at the time of seizure, the first lot seized would have more than covered his fines.

We will accept the kind offer of "A Lover of Truth," and print in "The Republican" "Boulanger's Critical Examination of the Life of St. Paul," agreeable to his recommendation, but we wish to begin it with a new volume, the first number of which will appear on the First of January, under the joint title of "The Republican and Anti-Christ." We have had a revelation from the real Anti-Christ, and we are assured this new God will make a grand, an imposing, and an astonishing appearance in the ensuing year. The general explanation of the prophecies concerning him are not correct: he will put down Christ for ever, and establish, not only a millenium, but a perpetual civilization among mankind.

EDITOR.

ERRATA.

In Mrs. Wright's Speech page 816 for *as a vice*, read *as advice*. Several other trivial errors appeared in it, but as they were such as every reader may detect and correct we forbear to notice them.

The £2 acknowledged last week from *Toel Martin*, should have been from *Tod Morton*.

Mrs. S. Wright returns thanks to Mr. Fairbrother for Five Shillings, left at No. 5, Water Lane.

H. Boyle and W. V. Holmes acknowledge the receipt of Five Shillings each from Mr. Grattan.

An Enemy to Persecution. One Sovereign each to the imprisoned Shopmen of Mr. Carlile. Per Mr. J. W. Trust.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street. All Communications (post paid) are requested to be sent to Dorchester Gaol, until a further Address to some House or Shop be given.—Orders, with remittances, or references for payment, will be punctually attended to. Country Agents will find the most liberal Terms for prompt Payment.